



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ON SUNDRY CONFIXES.

Nothing could be more important in morphological studies than to make collections of words arranged by their suffixes; and when any considerable number of instances of the same suffix is in phonetic accord in various languages the inference that the suffix was proethnic is almost unavoidable. This in turn leads to all manner of adjustments as between stem and suffix to bring them into phonetic accord. If such adjustments are discreetly made the stems and suffixes rouse in our minds a feeling that they were actual and not merely postulated entities. The stem or root parts of words we often succeed in satisfactorily defining, but the greater actuality the suffix acquires as a proethnic entity, the more elusive it becomes in point of definition; the more certain its formula becomes, the less it invites the pragmatic man in us to its interpretation as a fact. But, if we are to probe after the fact behind the formula, we must resist the spell of the equation, with its *x y z*, and attack individual words or groups, as they appear in individual languages; not forgetting as we do it that the pragmatic objection is as easy to make as it is hard to refute. The goal to reach is to find the compounding word from which the suffix got its start; and this method of explanation again involves phonetic adjustments as between prior and posterior members of the compounds postulated. With so much by way of preamble,¹ I turn to a discussion of the following words:

1) Paeonian *μόναπος* 'bison.'

Not long ago, in the pages of this Journal,² I derived *ἄνθρωπος* 'man' from *ἄντρο* + *-ώπος* or *-όπος*, with the definition 'cave-dwelling' or, to define it in Latin, for the sake of the etymology of the second member of the compound, 'spelunci-saepis';³ and similarly I explained *κύκλωψ* as 'rotundi-saepis'; justifying *-ώπος*

¹ See further A. J. P. XXV, 177.

² XXV, 312 fg.

³ An interesting early analysis of the possessive or *bahuvrīhi* occurs in Varro, Menip., 179 quid? tu non vides in vineis, quod tria pala habeant, tripales dici?

and - $\acute{\omega}\psi$ by Latin *saepis/sēps*, and postulating a base $\text{S}\bar{\text{E}}\text{-P-}/\text{S}\bar{\text{E}}\text{-BH}$,¹ which I should now prefer to write $\text{S}\bar{\text{E}}(\text{Y})\text{-P-}$ $\text{S}\bar{\text{E}}(\text{Y})\text{-BH-}$, to account for the Latin spelling *saepis*. To this group I would now add Skr. *sabha* 'conventio, domus' and Goth. *sibja* 'sippe.'

The Cyclopes (see Euripides in his *Cyclops*, 21) were $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ 'one-eyed', and so were the Arimaspians (Aeschylus, *Prom.* 804). Here we must have a case of fable originating in "disease of language", to use what is, after all, a very convenient name for one aspect of "popular etymology". In Homer (*Odys.* 9. 112 fg.) the Cyclopes dwelt in caves, each giving laws to his own children and wives, and recking not the one of the other; and Polyphemus, at least, dwelt in solitude (*ibid.* 410), was $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\psi$, 'singulari-saepis.'

This brings us to the Paeonian name of the bison or buffalo, $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma$ (Aristotle, *H. A.*, 9. 45, 1) $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$ (*ib.* *Mirab.* 1), and $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\psi$ (Aelian, *N. A.*, 7, 3), which has not inappropriately been interpreted by 'iubatus', and connected with the group to which English *mane*, Lat. *monile* 'necklace' belongs.² Another designation appropriate to the bison bull would be 'solitary' (cf. Fr. *sanglier* < *singularem* 'wild boar'; $\mu\omicron\nu\iota\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, same sense), for the encyclopaedias tell us that the Wiesent lives alone.³ Accordingly, if we may venture to analyze a Paeonian word by Greek phonetic laws, we might derive our forms from *mono-* 'solitary' + $\eta\alpha\pi\omicron\varsigma/\eta\alpha\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma/\hbar\omicron\pi\varsigma$ 'dwelling', though even so we need not exclude the interpretation 'mane-hedged', say 'saeti-sēptus', a definition also applicable to the name $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ⁴ 'bison', which may be analyzed as *mono* + $\hbar\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (: Lat. *saeta*),⁵ and defined by 'mane-haired.'

Whether this analysis will accord with Paeonian phonetics, I cannot say, but the only assumption of moment is that intervocalic (or initial) *s* in Paeonian became an aspirate: all the rest would seem not in disaccord with the slight Paeonian vocabulary now under control.⁶

In conclusion, we may note a curious correspondence between the $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\pi\omicron\iota$ of Aristotle (in Aelian, $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\epsilon\varsigma$) and the Cyclopes, who were also $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ (with a different accent), for Aristotle tells a

¹ l. c. 309, fn. 1.

² See Froehde in *BB.* 20, 210.

³ See also Parker, *Oregon Trail*, Ch. VII, "a solitary buffalo bull."

⁴ Cited from Antigonus Carystius (*B. c.* 250); but here the emendation of $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ to $\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\varsigma$ readily suggests itself.

⁵ See *A. J. P.*, XXVI, 183.

⁶ See Kretschmer, *Gesch. d. Griech. Spr.* I, 246-249.

queer tale to the effect that the *μόναποι*, before parturition, enclosed themselves in walls of dung. The coincidence of this tale with the tradition that the Cyclopes were wall-builders raises the question whether the term *μόνωπες* (*μονῶπες*) was associated with the building of walls.

And yet another possibility: in both his accounts of the Paeonian buffalo Aristotle locates the animal in the mountains, which suggests that *μονο-* is a cognate of Latin *mons*, cf. Gallic *Herminius* (*mons*).

2) *ἡμεδ-απός* 'nostras'; *ποδ-απός* 'cuias.'

These words, assuming the correctness of the current division, as printed, invite interpretation by 'nostri praesepis', 'cuius praesepis' or, in German, 'von unserer—, welcher sippe.' This in turn leads to their derivation, so far as the "suffix" is concerned, from *-άπος*, cognate with *praesēpe*, Skr. *sabhā*, Goth. *sibja*.

Can it be that *ἡμεδ-* is a genuine ablative (cf. Skr. *asmād* 'nobis'), and *-άπος* an abl.-gen. from a weak stem *səp-*? Supposing a primitive locution like *πὸδ-άπος ἔρχεται* 'quo (ex) praesepe advenis', it were easy to mistake *ποδαπός* for a nominative. The type is as old as the Homeric poems, in which *ἀλλοδαπός* 'alius praesepis' is not uncommon.

3) Gothic *fram-aps* 'alienus.'

Satisfactory cognates for Skr. *ātati* 'errat', *āti-this* 'erro, hospes' have not been pointed out. We would naturally write for these words the bases *ETE-/OTO-/* and *ETə-*, and the suffix of *āti-this* may be identical with the "suffix" of Lat. *hostis*, from *E)GHOS-(S)TIS*.¹ Here also we might put the preposition-adverb *āti* 'beyond.'

In Gothic *fram-aps* 'stranger', identical in its first part with English *from* 'ab', we might regard *-aps* as a cognate of *ātati*; and so, in Latin, *com-es* 'companion' would naturally derive from *com-ets*.

4) *ἔται* 'socii, comites, clientes.'

This Homeric word has generally been explained as a derivation of the group of which Lat. *suus* may be taken as a representative, and the startform **σFέται* may be taken as nearly certain.

¹ See Mod. Lang. Notes 22, 38.

We may, however, explain σF - as a reduction of the preposition whose Greek form is $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$, but which appears in a shorter form in Lith. *sù*, O. B. *sũ*-; thus $*\sigma F$ -*érai* is directly comparable in formation with Lat. *comes* and Gothic *framaps*.

5) *ἔθνος* 'tribe.'

With *ἔθνος* I think of a nomadic race, and that it may be derived from $*\acute{\epsilon}r$ -*σνος*, or rather, $*\acute{\epsilon}r$ + *hvos*. This I am tempted further to analyze, and define as 'wandering-band', explaining $\acute{\epsilon}r$ - as above in *ἔραι*, and guessing that *-σνος* may be derived from the base *SNĒ(V)*- as found in Skr. *snāyus* 'band, sinew.' The Homeric attest of *F*- would demand a startform $*\sigma F$ -*έθνος* 'co-wandering band', but in *ὀθνεῖος* 'alienus' a form without σF - would seem to appear.

6) *μόνος*, *ξυνός*.

I have, in another place,¹ explained *ξένφος* 'stranger' from ϵ)ξ 'out' + *ἐνφος* 'incola' (: \sqrt{wes} 'habitare'). This explanation is also applicable to $*\mu\omicron\nu$ -*φος* 'solus-habitans', in which *-φος* has sunk to a minimum of meaning. We may recognize the same "confix"—for this seems to me a convenient term for a suffix developed from a wider application of what was once a compounding final—in *ξυνός*, if this be from $*\xi\upsilon\nu$ *φος*. The length of the *υ* would probably assign the word to a non-Attic dialect. It is quite true that in *ξυνός*, quasi 'communis', the sense of *-φος* has almost vanished—but cf. the derivatives Doric *ξυνάν* and Sophocles' *ξυνών* 'amicus'—not appreciably more, however, than in *communis* the etymological sense of *-munis* has grown pale.²

7) Latin *quōdius* 'whose?'

In view of Skr. *madīyas* 'mine', currently explained as coming from the ablv. *mad*- + a suffix *-īyas*,³ we might set up for *quōdius* the startform $*quōdīus$, in which *-ius* is a "possessive" suffix added to the ablative *quōd* (? or to the neuter acc. *quod*?). The same formation is found in Osc. *pūiū* 'quoia' and, as the Italic dialects do not show conclusively any other phonetic treatment of *-dy-*, I lean to the conviction that the uniform product was *-j-*, a conviction for which all general analogy would seem to pronounce.

¹ Mod. Lang. Notes, l. c.; cf. Class. Quarterly 1, no. 1.

² I feel in *com-munis* some trace of *moenia*, as well as of *munia*, though Walde does not mention the former.

³ See Brugmann, KvGr. §§ 520, 524.

It is clear how easily this possessive with masculine nouns would have been felt as a genitive, and the undifferentiation of *quis* for sex-gender would help *quoius* to do duty for both sex-genders. As the old locative genitive *quōi* was doing further duty as a dative the pair *quoi/quoius* gave rise to *ēi* : *ēius*, *hūi(c)* : *hūius*, *illi* : *illius*, etc.

The assumed derivation furnishes a clue for the preciser definition of the suffix *yo* which indicates "Besitz, Abstammung und sonstige Arten der Zugehörigkeit."¹ If we start with "Abstammung" it is hard not to guess—however little we can prove—that *-yo-* belongs with \sqrt{ey} 'ire'; and so also might *-iyas* in Skr. *madžyas*, which would thus mean 'a me iens.'

I now pass to a discussion of some troublesome instances of the appearance of *-ēnus* in Latin, apparently parallel with *-ānus*, or *-īnus*.

8) Latin *laniena*.

Skutsch's theory that in *laniēna* and *aliēnus*² *iē* is dissimilated from *iī* has been questioned rather than seriously disproved. The evidence of a word like *Tullianum*, to say nothing of *Sestiānus* and its kind, should throw grave doubt on the supposed dissimilation; nor will anyone, I suppose, now question that in *societas*, *pietas*, etc. *-ie-* was reached from *-io-* on its way to *-ii-* and not by dissimilation from *-ii-*.

From *laniena* (and *aliēnus*) evidence has been drawn for a proethnic suffix *-EYNO/-OYNO*, ultimately reducible to locatives in *-EY/OY*, extended by *NO*;³ and it has been assumed that *-iei/-ioi-* would yield Latin *-iē-*. But all this explanation seems to me probably beside the mark. I see no reason to doubt that the flexional type of *lanio* (preserved in the Digest) is not at least as old as the type of *lanius* and, granting this, the flexion *lanio* gen. **laniēnis* may be compared with *Neriō Neriēnis*, *Aniō Aniēnis*; and in view of *Aniēnus* we may derive an adjectival *laniēna* from *laniō*.⁴

But *laniena* may be a Latin compound, *laniē-* (cf. *socie-tas*) + *vēna*, cognate with *vēnus* (? *vēnum*) 'sale', though in the com-

¹ See Brugmann, Grundriss, II¹ § 63, p. 118.

² See Walde's lexicon, s. v.

³ Brugmann, Grundriss, II², § 188.

⁴ See Brugmann, l. c. § 184, Anm.

plexes *vēn(um)-il* and *ven(um)-dat*, I always think of *vēnum* (like *domum*) as 'market'. The contraction of **lānie-vēna* to *laniēna* seems not essentially to differ from *obliviſcor* > *obliscor*. Varro is cited¹ for *ex tabernis lanienis*, whence we may infer a fully inflected adjective **laniēnus*, *-a-*, *-um*. Compounds with *-vēnus* would be genuine Latin alongside the Greekish compounds in *-polium*; cf. Plautus, Ep. 198,

per medicinas per tonstrinas, in gymnasio atque in foro
per myropolia et lanienas circumque argentarias.

Nor need we postulate a formal compound. Supposing **laniēna*, like *medicina* and *tonstrina*, to have been in existence, as it was the "place for the sale of meat" *vēnus* 'sale' may have affected it.

9) Latin *aliēnus*.

The prevailing possessive use of *aliēnus* predisposes us to see in it the same formation that we recognize in Goth. *meins*.² But this is by no means inevitable, for *alienus*, as early as it is of record, distinctly means 'stranger' and 'strange', and may have gone through the same semantic development as Gothic *framaps*, which has reached in German *fremd* the following usage: "fremd im gegensatz zu eigen: fremdes eigentum; menge dich nicht in fremde sachen; sich mit fremden federn schmücken u. s. w."³ If we start with 'stranger' as the original sense we may postulate a startform **aliē(d)- + uēnus* 'from elsewhere coming', comparing *advena*, *convena* 'stranger', which have taken the flexional type of *incola* 'inhabitant, native'.⁴

Niedermann⁵ has derived *aliēnus* from **al-yes-nos*, seeing in *-yes-* a comparative suffix. In this I cannot follow him. I feel no comparative force in *ἄλλότριος* 'alienus', which I derive from an adverb **ἄλλοτρα* 'otherwhere'⁶ and define by 'from otherwhere coming' > 'belonging to another.' The comparative suffix in *ἡμέτερος ὑμέτερος* might seem in point, but here, as (ultimately) in *ἄλλότριος, -τερος ... -τερος* are contrasting suffixes, just as in *alter... alter*, while the possession rests in *ἡμε-, ὑμε-*. So, in view of the

¹ Cf. Non. 532. 20.

² See Brugmann, I. c. § 188 (p. 274).

³ Cited from Heyne's Deutsches Woerterbuch.

⁴ Possibly also *peregrīnus* is a compound of **peregrī(d?) + -venus*.

⁵ BB. 25, 83.

⁶ Prellwitz compares Sk. *anydtra*.

possessive force of the Sanskrit gen. plurals *nas vas*, contrast, not possession, may be the value of the *-ter* of *noster vester*.

10) *Fibrēnus* 'Beaver-burn'.

In view of *Aniēnus*, byform to *Anio*, Gen. *Aniēnis*, it would seem unnecessary in this Volscian river name to explain *-ēnus* from proethnic *-eino-/-oino-*. Here also we may have a compound. The widely diffused base of Greek *φρέαρ* is set down as *BHRĒW*, of which the English representative is *bourn, burn*, from a stem *BHRUN-*;¹ if we may imagine a strong stem *BHRĒ(W)NO*, then *Fibrēnus* might be from a compound **fī[bro]-brēnus*, and mean 'Beaver-burn.'

11) Latin *terrēnus*.

This word meets its simplest explanation by adducing the stem **tēres*, attested by O. Ir. *tír*.² It is not to be denied, however, that it may be of the same derivation as *terreus*, in which case the stem *TERREYO*-³ had beside it *TERREY-NO-*, and the special phonetic treatment that yielded *terrēnus* may have been vowel assimilation from the *e* of the first syllable.

12) Plautine *sociennus* (Plautus *Aulularia* 659).

Neither of the current explanations⁴ of this hapax compels conviction. The passage is,

ibo intro atque illi socienno tuo iam interstringam gulam;

and the situation is as follows:

Euclio, the miser, while seeking to hide his money-pot, had been startled first by a cook, and then by his would-be son-in-law, Megadorus, who had sent the cook in to prepare the wedding-feast. In the altercation with Megadorus he shows some disgust at all the food and the tribe of cooks that had been sent into the house, and suspects Megadorus of planning to get him drunk and steal his pot of money. Soon he discovers in an adjoining room the servant of his daughter's lover, and at once suspects him of being another who would rob him of his treasure. While searching him he hears a noise in the next room and makes ready to go and choke (*interstringere* here only, it would seem, in Plautus) a

¹ Brugmann, l. c. § 455.

² See Thurneysen in *KZ.* 28, 147.

³ Cf. Brugmann l. c. § 122.

⁴ See Walde's lexicon, s. v. *socius*.

supposed confederate of the slave he has in hand, and this confederate he calls *sociennus*. Supposing the scene with the greedy cook still to be lingering in his mind, we may suspect that *sociennus* is a translation of σύσσιτος 'mess-mate'. Thus *socius* 'comes' would be extended in *sociennus* to the sense 'companion' (from *com* + *panis*): thus explained, *sociennus* contains in its last member a derivation of *edit* 'eats', say **eda-nos* 'eater', cognate with Gr. ἐδών, Skr. *annam*: Lat. *edō* 'glutton.' The combination of *socienno* with *interstringam gulam* lies in the same metaphorical plane as our colloquial 'to choke the stuffing out of one'.

Or, if the Greek original had δμῆλιξ 'comrade', *sociennus* might mean 'qui socios annos habet,'¹ cf.

Promissus socios ubi nunc Hymenæus in annos,
Qui mihi coniugii sponsor et obses erat?

If the formation of *sociennus* was inspired by a proper name—and Schulze² has given a most ingenious interpretation of Laberius' homo *levenna* as 'levis ἐκ τριγωνίας'—I think rather of the type of Osc. *Perkednies* (gen.) 'Percenni' which, if known to Plautus, was liable to off-hand interpretation as 'qui percas edit'.³

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

¹ Ovid, *Her.*, 2, 33-34.

² Latein. Eigennamen, 283.

³ Cf. *Captivi* 160, where the changes are rung on *Pistorenses*, etc.